

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Official Letter dated September 16, 2003. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16 and 25 have been amended. Claims 17 through 24 and 26 through 29 have been cancelled. New claims 30 through 35 have been added. The application now includes claims 1 through 16, 25, and 30 through 35, with claims 1, 2, 16 and 25 being independent claims. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to place it in conformance with the drawings. The amendment to the specification does not introduce any new matter.

In the Official Letter, the Examiner noted that claim 16 contained a grammatical error. Accordingly, applicants have amended claim 16 to correct the grammatical error.

The Examiner also rejected independent claims 16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Accordingly, applicants have amended claims 16 and 25 to address the concerns of the Examiner and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw her rejection.

In the Official Letter, the Examiner further stated that claims 2 through 7 and 11 through 15 included allowable subject matter, but were rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner also stated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants have rewritten claim 2 in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1. Therefore, rewritten independent claim 2 is now allowable and applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw her objection to the claim.

Similarly, objected claims 3 through 7, 14 and 15 are dependent upon rewritten independent claim 2. Accordingly claims 3 through 7, 14 and 15 should now be allowable and applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw her objection to the claims.

Claims 11 through 13 are dependent upon amended claim 9. Because amended claim 9 is dependent upon rewritten claim 2, for the reasons given above, claims 11 through 13 should now be allowable. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow amended claims 11 through 13.

The Examiner also stated that independent claims 16 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome their rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As described above, claims 16 and 25 have been amended to overcome their rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw her objection to claims 16 and 25.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 8 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,723,945 to Schermerhorn in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,629 to Kanazawa et al. The Examiner stated that the Kanazawa et al. reference teaches three sets of electrodes formed on the first substrate of a flat plasma display with Y electrodes parallel to and corresponding to each of the pairs of sustainer electrodes Xe and Xo, and at least one is adjacent to the first sustainer electrode Xe and can interpreted as an auxiliary electrode.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite a pair of auxiliary electrodes deposited upon a first substrate parallel to and corresponding to each of the pairs of sustainer electrodes. As described in column 8, lines 64 through 65, and as shown in Fig. 13, of the Kanazawa et al. reference, the term Xe refers to even numbered X sustaining electrodes while the term Xo refers to odd numbered X sustaining electrodes. Additionally, the Kanazawa et al. reference states, in column 10, lines 27 through 37 that:

The Y electrodes are connected to a scan driver 62 serving as a selecting circuit, and connected as a whole to a Y *sustaining* circuit 63 for applying a signal used to sustain discharge. The scan driver 62 produces a scanning pulse. The Y sustaining circuit 63 produces a sustaining discharge and applies it to the Y electrodes 51. On the other hand, the Xo electrodes 52o and Xe electrodes 52e are connected as a whole to an odd X *sustaining* circuit 61o and an even X *sustaining* circuit 61e, respectively, which apply signals to sustain discharge. (Emphasis added.)

Based upon the above description, applicants believe that the Kanazawa et al. reference discloses groups of three sustaining electrodes. Therefore, combining the structure of the Kanazawa et al. reference with the plasma display panel disclosed in the Schermerhorn reference will produce a structure entirely different from the structure of pairs of auxiliary electrodes corresponding to pairs of sustaining

electrodes as recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, applicants believe that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw her rejection of the claim.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,201 to Schermerhorn et al. The Examiner stated that the sole difference between claim 1 of the present application and claim 1 of the '201 Schermerhorn et al. reference is that the patent claim refers to a "control electrode" while the present application refers to an "auxiliary electrode". The Examiner further stated that the difference is nominal and therefore obvious. However, a timely filed terminal disclaimer may be used to overcome a rejection based upon a non-statutory double patenting application. Accordingly, upon receiving notification that amended independent claim 1 is allowable, applicants will file a terminal disclaimer.

Claims 8 through 10 have been amended to depend upon rewritten independent claim 2. As discussed above, the Examiner has indicated that rewritten claim 2 is allowable. Therefore, amended claims 8 through 10 should also now be allowable. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow amended claims 8 through 10.

Applicants have added new claims 30 through 35 which recite the limitations of original claims 8 through 13, respectively. Therefore, new claims 30 through 35 do not add any new matter. Additionally, new claims 30 through 35 are dependent upon amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, applicants believe that claims 30 through 35 are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner allow the claims.

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.